

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) For Authority to, Among Other Things, Increase Its Authorized Revenues For Electric Service in 2003, And to Reflect That Increase in Rates.

Application 02-05-004
(Filed May 3, 2002)

Investigation on the Commission's Own Motion into the Rates, Operations, Practices, Service and Facilities of Southern California Edison Company.

Investigation 02-06-002
(Filed June 6, 2002)

**ASSIGNED COMMISSIONER'S RULING ESTABLISHING SCOPE,
SCHEDULE, AND PROCEDURES FOR PROCEEDING**

1. Summary

Pursuant to Article 2.5 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure (Rules), and following the prehearing conference (PHC) held on June 13, 2002, this ruling addresses the scope, schedule, and related matters in Southern California Edison Company's (SCE) test year 2003 general rate case (GRC).

2. Notice of Prehearing Conference, Public Participation Hearings, and Evidentiary Hearings

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a second PHC is set for Monday, November 4, 2002, at 10:00 a.m., in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that public participation hearings are set for the dates, times, and places set forth in Appendix A to this ruling.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that an evidentiary hearing is set for Tuesday, November 12, 2002, at 9:00 a.m., in the Commission Courtroom, State Office Building, 505 Van Ness Avenue, San Francisco, California.

3. Scope and Phasing of Proceeding

By definition, the scope of a GRC is necessarily broad. As I indicated at the June 13 PHC, I intend to take a broad, policy-based approach in this GRC to undertake the complex tasks of reintegrating utility service formerly unbundled by this Commission, establishing utility accountability, and restoring SCE's economic health (Tr. PHC. p.9). My intention in this GRC is to reflect the interests of ratepayers by identifying the proper structure for SCE to serve its load. Unless otherwise stated, any matters raised by the application or which may be reasonably inferred from the proposals therein are within the scope of the proceeding. The Commission's order instituting the companion investigation (OII) makes clear that the Commission will seek proposals other than SCE's, and that the proceeding will "study and determine issues surrounding SCE's revenue requirement, rates, practices, service, facilities, ... and maintenance practices." (OII, p. 2.)

By rulings issued on June 6, 2002 and June 20, 2002, parties were provided with a briefing paper prepared by the Commission's Energy Division. The paper recommends a scope of issues the Commission should address in this GRC. SCE, the Office of Ratepayer Advocates (ORA), and TURN have responded to the Energy Division paper.¹

¹ By letter dated June 12, 2002, SCE transmitted a detailed analysis of the Energy Division briefing paper to the Commission. At the PHC, SCE presented a document showing where issues raised in the Energy Division paper are being addressed. A copy is bound into the transcript of the PHC. By letter dated July 1, 2002, SCE offered

Footnote continued on next page

SCE believes that nearly all the issues raised in the paper are within the scope of the GRC, and that the few issues outside of the GRC are the subjects of other Commission proceedings. ORA believes the briefing paper contains a good list of issues that should be addressed and developed in the GRC. TURN views the briefing paper as a useful tool but recommends that the scope of the GRC not be constricted or expanded based on the Energy Division paper.

The issues recommended by the Energy Division are consistent with my preferred approach to broaden the scope of this proceeding. Parties' testimony should include the traditional review of current utility spending and the four issue areas identified by the Energy Division: investment planning, safety and reliability, customer service, and utility operations. I intend to adopt the medium-to-long term policy outlook recommended by the Energy Division. I am especially interested in parties' views on what type of industry and regulatory environments SCE should be operating under in the next ten years, and mechanisms the Commission should consider to ensure utility accountability.

3.1 Investment Planning

My objective is to determine how SCE is, and how it should be, positioning itself to resume provision of fully integrated utility service. Testimony should make recommendations for overall Commission policy on the utility's role in providing retail service over the next ten years. I invite testimony which examines SCE's organizational structure, internal resources, and decision-making processes for planning and investment activities. Parties should also

additional comments on the paper. ORA and TURN filed comments in response to the June 20 ruling.

submit proposals on how the Commission should structure and oversee SCE's investment planning process.

To assist parties with proposal development, I direct SCE to file supplemental testimony by October 1, 2002 to address the following questions and issues:

- Does SCE have a department or group that approves and coordinates utility planning and investment decisions? How does this department make decisions about integrated utility planning and capital management (e.g. how does SCE assign funding and priority?) Is there a medium-to-long term plan that guides investment choices?
- Does SCE have an adequate organization to plan for and meet future resource procurement and production needs? Describe the staff qualifications and resources necessary for SCE to meet the procurement requirement.
- What procurement options is SCE considering (other than contracts?) What other options should be considered?
- What assumptions is SCE making about building new generation?
- What is SCE's current approach to generation, distribution, transmission, and demand-side planning? How does SCE develop its capital and O&M budgets and evaluate potential projects?
- How are specific projects evaluated? What is the process for project approval? What are the criteria to select the sequence of projects?

SCE did not present a resource plan in its application because, it explains, policies regarding the future role of the utility in building new generation are being addressed in Rulemaking (R.)01-10-024. Also, SCE maintains, traditional uses for the resource plan – determining demand-side management (DSM) cost effectiveness and generation marginal costs – are no longer relevant.

The immediate focus of R.01-10-024 is to adopt a near-term procurement plan and cost recovery mechanism. By focusing only on near-term procurement through contracts, the functions, as scoped out in the Procurement Order Instituting Rulemaking (OIR), contribute to the fragmentation of the various utility functions: distribution, transmission, and generation. The utilities were also directed to begin work on resource plans which focus on identifying new system resource additions for reliability or cost-savings. It is not my intention to duplicate in this proceeding the litigation currently underway in R.01-10-024. However, as I stated at the PHC, “the role of the utility going forward in terms of not merely procurement but also energy production is properly before us in this GRC...” (Tr. PHC, p. 58.) The proper forum to address integrated resource planning is not in the Procurement OIR, which is focused on short-term procurement functions through contracts, but in a GRC where a utility can take into account the configuration of the grid, demand side issues as well as retained and planned generation in a comprehensive manner.

TURN is concerned that determining SCE’s long term procurement function would be impossible without a substantial extension of time for testimony and hearings. TURN proposes that if procurement-related issues are to be addressed, the issues be considered in a separate phase of the GRC.

I do not concur with TURN’s assessment that substantial delay or a separate phase of the proceeding is necessary to consider procurement issues not being resolved in R.01-10-024. As I stated at the PHC, this is not going to be an interminable proceeding. (Tr. PHC, p. 60.)

SCE did not include a showing on DSM cost effectiveness because that issue is now addressed in separate utility filings. Again, while it is not my intention to duplicate activity in other proceedings such as R.01-08-028, the scope

of this proceeding is broad, and parties are not precluded from raising DSM-related issues.

TURN seeks to address past spending and capital investments for forecasting future spending. These matters are clearly within the scope of the GRC. With respect to past capital investments, TURN asks that investments made since the last GRC, i.e., since 1994, be included within the scope of the proceeding. TURN's request appears reasonable and is hereby approved. Testimony should also present an analysis of SCE's planning and decision-making processes for capital additions.

Edison's Results of Operation Model (RO Model) should properly reflect utility retained generation costs. We note that Pacific Gas and Electric Company's (PG&E's) 1999 GRC made a comprehensive showing of all its functions, including distribution, transmission and generation. PG&E's last GRC RO Model is a good example of how to properly present generation cost issues.

3.2 Safety and Reliability

The Energy Division paper recommends, among other things, an examination of SCE's safety, reliability, and maintenance standards. ORA, TURN, and Coalition of California Utility Employees expect to address similar issues. I anticipate parties will offer comparisons of SCE's reliability standards with those of other utilities, examine the results of SCE's current Performance-Based Ratemaking (PBR) standards, and propose recommendations on safety and reliability standards for use after SCE's current PBR expires. Parties should propose an appropriate level of maintenance expenditures, including recommendations for parts of SCE's system where maintenance should be targeted.

3.3 Customer Service

I invite proposals which evaluate and suggest improvements to SCE's customer service programs. Testimony should evaluate current PBR customer satisfaction standards, compare SCE standards to those of other utilities, and make recommendations on new standards and performance measures. Parties should assess the effectiveness of SCE's billing system, website, and call center to meet customer needs: web-based contacts and responses, 800 telephone numbers, call management systems, and voice mail.

I am particularly interested in proposals regarding the need for localized customer service, such as neighborhood customer service centers and outreach efforts to local communities. Proposals should include recommendations regarding the improvement and maintenance of current outreach programs, including the Cool Centers and the Women Minority Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (WMDVBE) programs.

3.4 Utility Operations

In this GRC proceeding, I would like to develop a consistent overall policy for how SCE undertakes its operations. In considering this policy, I ask the parties to examine the decision-making processes the utility uses to determine how to provide safe and reliable service to its customers at a reasonable cost. Parties should provide testimony on how SCE's 2003 test year application fits in within the utility's established decision-making process.

I also ask parties to conduct a review of SCE's land-use and land management practices, especially with respect to environmental impacts, use of utility lands for unregulated activities by SCE, its affiliates, or third parties, and incidental benefits to ratepayers and the community at large. To facilitate this review, I direct SCE to file supplemental testimony to describe how it sets priorities for land management, and if

it places different priorities on different types of land (such as land related to transmission assets versus hydroelectric assets.) Testimony should include an inventory of all lands related to SCE's hydroelectric facilities, and how these lands are used to maximize public benefit. As described in Section 3.1, supplemental testimony is due October 1, 2002.

3.5 Mohave Generating Station

The Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe have each raised issues pertaining to SCE's Mohave Generating Station. Both of these parties are interested in the continued operation of the plant, a matter that will not be decided in this proceeding. To the extent, if any, that Commission determinations in this proceeding (for example, those with respect to capital expenditures at Mohave), may have a bearing on the disposition of the plant, the Navajo Nation, the Hopi Tribe, and other parties may address these issues here.

3.6 SCE's Phase 2 Proposal

In accordance with the Rate Case Plan adopted by Decision (D.)89-01-040, as modified for SCE by D.93-07-030, SCE proposes that unit marginal costs, marginal cost revenue responsibility, revenue allocation and rate design be addressed in a "pricing phase" (Phase 2) of this GRC. This proposal is reasonable and is hereby adopted. Phase 1 is designated to consider all other matters. In the following section of this ruling I explain my determination that the Phase 1 schedule proposed by SCE should be adjusted by three months. While this ruling does not establish a detailed procedural schedule for Phase 2, I hereby determine that the date for SCE's Phase 2 showing should be adjusted for consistency with the Phase 1 schedule. Accordingly, SCE's Phase 2 showing is due on October 30, 2002.

4. Schedule

SCE states that its proposed schedule is based on the Commission's Rate Case Plan schedule. SCE's proposal would have required the ORA to serve its testimony on July 19, 2002.² ORA proposes that its testimony be due on November 15, 2002. At the PHC, several parties stated their support for ORA's proposed schedule. SCE believes that the Commission should proceed according to its proposed schedule, although SCE's principle concern appears to be completing the proceeding by the end date provided in the Rate Case Plan.³ (Tr. PHC, p. 53.) SCE states that resolving this proceeding at the earliest possible date will restore its standing before the financial community.

Legislative direction contained within Section 309.5 (c) of the Public Utilities Code, which provides the following with respect to ORA:

The commission shall, by rule or order, provide for the assignment of personnel to, and the functioning of, the division. The division may employ experts necessary to carry out its functions. Personnel and resources shall be provided to the division at a level sufficient to ensure that customer and subscriber interests are fairly represented in all significant proceedings.

Since the Commission is obligated to provide the resources necessary for ORA to represent customer interests, ORA's ability to provide such representation should not be undermined by the adoption of a procedural schedule that ORA cannot reasonably be expected to meet.

² By electronic mail message sent on July 9, 2002, parties were notified that the due date for ORA's testimony was being extended to October 17, 2002.

³ By letter dated June 21, 2002, SCE stated that it would agree to a four-week extension of its proposed schedule.

I have determined that the need to provide ORA with adequate time to prepare its case outweighs our interest in completing the processing of this case under SCE's proposed schedule. While I am mindful of the need for this Commission to consider SCE's standing before the financial community, I am not persuaded that granting a three-month extension of the proposed date for ORA's testimony will unduly affect that standing. Accordingly, ORA's testimony is due on October 17, 2002.

ORA will require adequate time to review SCE's supplemental testimony and prepare testimony addressing the issues described in Section 3.1 and 3.4. The procedural schedule accommodates this additional time without extending the overall schedule. ORA's testimony addressing these issues is due December 6, 2002. Intervenor testimony on these and all other Phase 1 issues is due on December 6, 2002.

Several parties have suggested that the direct and rebuttal hearings be combined. This approach was implemented in PG&E's test year 1999 GRC, and in D.00-07-050 the Commission indicated an intent to modify the Rate Case Plan to provide for such an approach generally. SCE proposes keeping the Rate Case Plan's provision for separate rebuttal hearings. Among other things, SCE points out that given the limited time available for discovery, it is necessary for it to cross-examine ORA and intervenor witnesses to clarify their recommendations before rebuttal testimony is drafted. I will approve SCE's proposal for a separate rebuttal phase, as it appears that this approach may potentially reduce overall hearing time by allowing SCE to prepare more focused rebuttal testimony. However, should SCE determine after further review and consultation with parties that combining direct and rebuttal hearings will potentially reduce the

overall processing time for this proceeding, I will entertain a joint proposal for doing so.

Consistent with the Rate Case Plan, SCE's proposed schedule provides for a 10-day interval between the service of rebuttal testimony and the commencement of rebuttal hearings. TURN recommends an interval of 4-6 weeks between rebuttal testimony and evidentiary hearings to accommodate discovery on assertions made for the first time in rebuttal testimony. It appears that rebuttal hearings may be conducted more fairly and efficiently if additional time for discovery is provided. The adopted schedule therefore provides an interval of four weeks between the service of concurrent rebuttal testimony and the commencement of rebuttal hearings.

This ruling sets a second PHC to take place shortly before the commencement of the evidentiary hearings. The purpose will be to take up any motions to strike not previously resolved, the order and scheduling of witnesses, and other procedural issues. Parties should serve their estimates of cross-examination time no later than three days prior to the PHC.

The procedural schedule set forth in Appendix B is hereby adopted for Phase 1 of this GRC. The Assigned Commissioner or the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) may modify the schedule as necessary.

5. Category of Proceeding and Need for Hearings

This ruling confirms the Commission's preliminary finding in Resolution ALJ 176-3088, dated May 16, 2002, that the category for this proceeding is ratesetting and that hearings are necessary. This ruling, only as to category, is appealable under the procedures in Rule 6.4.

6. Ex Parte Communications

The ex parte communication rules set forth in Rule 7(c) (ratesetting proceedings) apply to this proceeding.

7. Principal Hearing Officer

Pursuant to Public Utilities Code Section 1701.3, ALJ Wetzell is designated as the principal hearing officer for Phase 1 of this proceeding.

8. Final Oral Argument

Pursuant to Rule 8(d), any party requesting final oral argument before the Commission shall make such request by letter to the ALJ on the date set for filing of concurrent opening briefs.

9. Discovery

Parties did not raise any issues or questions regarding discovery at the PHC. I take the apparent absence of such issues as a positive sign, and urge the parties to continue to work cooperatively to submit timely data requests and responses thereto. If any party believes specific discovery rules or timelines are necessary for this proceeding, such concerns should be brought to the attention of the ALJ.

10. Service List

A current service list for this proceeding is available on the Commission's web page: <http://www.cpuc.ca.gov/published/proceedings/A0205004.htm>.

11. Filing and Service of Documents

At the PHC there was widespread but not unanimous support for using electronic service of documents in this proceeding. Pursuant to Rule 2.3(b), pleadings may be served in electronic form on those parties that provided an electronic mail address to the Commission. The subject line for any such transmittals should include the docket number and the words "SCE GRC."

With respect to service of testimony, it appears that a flexible approach is warranted. Service by electronic means is encouraged. Parties should use PDF format so that confusion regarding pagination is avoided. With respect to lengthy documents, parties should exercise judgment to avoid tying up servers and related problems, and consider such alternatives as notices of availability and use of SCE's website approach as discussed at the PHC. Any party that also wishes to receive testimony in a paper format may make that wish known by filing and serving a notice to that effect. All parties shall honor such requests.

Paper format copies shall be served on the Assigned Commissioner, the ALJ, and Energy Division representatives.

In order to accommodate parties who do not have ready access to Commission offices where filings are accepted, pleadings may be filed one day after their otherwise applicable due date provided that service is accomplished on the due date. Parties taking advantage of this authorization shall refer to this ruling so that Docket Office Examiners are alerted to the authorization.

12. Public Participation Hearings

A schedule of public participation hearings is attached as Appendix A. The public participation hearing set for October 23, 2002 in Alhambra will address only SCE's WMDVBE Program. SCE shall, in consultation with the Commission's Public Advisor, provide notice of the public participation hearings to its customers by billing envelope insert or by direct mailing, and by other appropriate means. The notice should clearly indicate the limited purpose of the October 23 hearing.

SCE shall have a representative available at each public participation hearing who is authorized to respond to customer inquiries and statements.

I ask that ORA provide representation at the hearings to the extent that its resources permit.

13. Procedural Ground Rules

The ground rules set forth in Appendix C are intended to promote fair and orderly hearings and efficient use of hearing time, and are hereby adopted for this proceeding.

IT IS RULED that:

1. The scope of this proceeding is as set forth in the foregoing discussion. Marginal costs, marginal cost revenue responsibility, revenue allocation and rate design shall be addressed in Phase 2 of this general rate case, and Phase 1 is designated to consider all other matters.
2. The schedule for Phase 1 of this proceeding is set forth in Appendix B. Southern California Edison Company (SCE) shall file its Phase 2 showing on October 30, 2002. Other aspects of the Phase 2 schedule shall be determined at a later date.
3. SCE shall file its supplementary testimony on October 1, 2002.
4. The Office of Ratepayers Advocates and other parties may file testimony addressing SCE's supplemental testimony on December 6, 2002.
5. The category for this proceeding is ratesetting. This ruling, only as to category, is appealable under the procedures in Rule 6.4 of the Commission's Rules of Practice and Procedure.
6. The ex parte communication rules set forth in Rule 7(c) apply to this proceeding.
7. Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) Wetzell is the principal hearing officer for Phase 1 of this proceeding.

8. Any party requesting final oral argument before the Commission shall make such request by letter to the ALJ on the date set for filing of concurrent opening briefs.

9. Parties may serve documents in electronic form to those parties that provided an electronic mail address to the Commission consistent with the foregoing discussion.

Dated August 8, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ CARL WOOD

Carl Wood
Assigned Commissioner

APPENDIX A
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HEARINGS

October 7, 2002 2:00 pm	Mission Viejo Library Sherri M. Butterfield Community Room 100 Civic Center Drive Mission Viejo, CA 92691
October 7, 2002 7:00 pm	Fullerton Marriott 2701 East Nutwood Avenue Fullerton, CA 92831
October 8, 2002 2:00 pm	Long Beach Public Library - Auditorium 101 Pacific Avenue Long Beach, CA 90822
October 8, 2002 7:00 pm	Veterans Memorial Complex – Rotunda Room 4117 Overland Avenue Culver City, CA 90230
October 9, 2002 2:00 pm	Palm Springs Convention Center 277 North Avenida Caballeros Palm Springs, CA 92262
October 9, 2002 7:00 pm	Palm Desert City Hall Council Chamber 73-510 Fred Waring Drive Palm Desert, CA 92260
October 21, 2002 2:00 pm and 7:00 pm	Radisson Hotel and Convention Center – Sycamore Room 295 North “E” Street San Bernardino, CA 92401

October 22, 2002 2:00 pm	Pomona City Hall Council Chamber 505 South Garey Avenue Pomona, CA 91766
October 22, 2002 7:00 pm	Corona Corona Public Library – Community Room A & B 650 South Main Street Corona, CA 92882
October 23, 2002 2:00 pm and 7:00 pm	Alhambra City Hall Council Chamber 111 South First Street Alhambra, CA 91801 NOTICE: The Alhambra public participation hearings will address Southern California Edison Company’s Women Minority Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise (WMDVBE) Program.
October 24, 2002 2:00 pm and 7:00 pm	City of Ventura – Community Meeting Room 501 Poli Street Ventura, CA 93001
October 29, 2002 2:00 pm and 7:00 pm	Lancaster City Hall Council Chamber 44933 N. Fern Avenue Lancaster, CA 93534
October 30, 2002 2:00 pm	Kern County Library - Auditorium 701 Truxtun Avenue Bakersfield, CA 93301
October 30, 2002 7:00 pm	Visalia Convention Center & Theatres San Joaquin Room C & D 303 E. Acequia Avenue Visalia, CA 93291

APPENDIX B
PHASE 1 PROCEDURAL SCHEDULE

Event	Date
SCE supplemental testimony served	10/01/02
Public participation hearings begin	10/07/02
ORA testimony served ⁴	10/17/02
Public participation hearings end	10/30/02
Estimates of cross-examination time	10/30/02
Prehearing conference	11/04/02
Direct evidentiary hearings begin	11/12/02
Intervenor testimony and remaining ORA testimony served	12/06/02
Direct evidentiary hearings end	01/24/03
Rebuttal testimony served*	01/27/03
Rebuttal hearings begin	02/24/03
Rebuttal hearings end	02/28/03
Comparison exhibit	03/10/03
Settlement conference	03/17/03
Concurrent opening briefs filed and served; Request for oral argument before the Commission submitted to ALJ	04/04/03
Concurrent reply briefs filed and served	04/21/03
Update materials served*	05/09/03
Update hearings begin	05/27/03
Update hearings end; projected submission date	05/30/03
Proposed decision issued	07/21/03
Comments on proposed decision	08/11/03
Reply comments	08/18/03
Final oral argument (if requested)	08/18/03
Final Commission decision	08/21/03

* Limitations on the scope of rebuttal and update testimony and related requirements set forth in the Rate Case Plan (D.)89-01-040 as modified by D.93-07-030) are applicable.

⁴ Except for issues described in Sections 3.1 and 3.4 of Scoping Memo.

APPENDIX C

PROCEDURAL GROUND RULES

Exhibit Format

See Rule 70 of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. Parties often fail to include a blank space two inches high by four inches wide to accommodate the ALJ's exhibit stamp. If necessary, add a cover sheet to the front of the exhibit. The common practice of pre-printing the docket number, a blank line for the exhibit number, and witness names(s) is acceptable, but it is not a substitute for the required two by four inch blank space to accommodate the exhibit stamp.

Exhibits should be bound on the left side or upper left-hand corner. Rubber bands and paper clips are unacceptable.

Excerpts from lengthy documents should include the title page and, if necessary for context, the table of contents of the document.

While Rule 2 permits a type size of no smaller than 10 points in filed documents, parties are asked to use a type face of no smaller than 12 points wherever practicable.

Exhibit Copies

See Rule 71. The original and one copy of each exhibit shall be furnished to the presiding officer and a copy shall be furnished to the reporter and to each party. The copy furnished to the presiding officer may be the mailed copy. Except for exhibits that are served prior to the hearing, parties are responsible for having sufficient copies available in the hearing room for each party in attendance.

Cross-Examination Exhibits

Allowing witnesses time to review new or unfamiliar documents can waste hearing time. The general rule is that a party who intends to introduce an exhibit in the course of cross-examination should provide a copy to the witness and the witness' counsel before the witness takes the stand on the day the exhibit is to be introduced. Documents in excess of two pages should be provided the day before. Generally, parties need not provide advance copies of documents to be used for impeachment or to obtain the witness' spontaneous reaction (although this practice is not encouraged).

Corrections

The practice of making extensive oral corrections to exhibits on the witness stand, requiring lengthy dictation exercises, causes delays. It should be avoided to the extent possible.

Hearing Hours

Hearings will generally run from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 a.m. with two morning breaks and from 1:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. with one afternoon break. Upon request, and assuming that hearings appear to be on schedule, hearings may run from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on Fridays.

Cross Examination Time

Parties are placed on notice that it may be necessary to limit and allocate cross-examination time as well as time for redirect and recross-examination.

Rebuttal Testimony

Prepared rebuttal testimony should include appropriate references to the testimony being rebutted. It is inappropriate, and a potential grounds for

striking, for any party to hold back direct presentations for introduction in rebuttal testimony.

Court Reporters

Common courtesy should always be extended to the reporters. Counsel should wait for witnesses to finish their answers, and witnesses should likewise wait for the whole question to be asked before answering. Counsel shall refrain from simultaneous arguments on motions and objections. Conversations at the counsel table or in the audience can be distracting to the reporter and other participants. Such distractions should be avoided.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I have by mail, and by electronic mail to the parties to which an electronic mail address has been provided, this day served a true copy of the original attached Assigned Commissioner's Ruling Establishing Scope, Schedule, and Procedures for Proceeding on all parties of record in this proceeding or their attorneys of record.

Dated August 8, 2002, at San Francisco, California.

/s/ JACQUELINE GORZUCH
Jacqueline Gorzoch

N O T I C E

Parties should notify the Process Office, Public Utilities Commission, 505 Van Ness Avenue, Room 2000, San Francisco, CA 94102, of any change of address to insure that they continue to receive documents. You must indicate the proceeding number on the service list on which your name appears.

The Commission's policy is to schedule hearings (meetings, workshops, etc.) in locations that are accessible to people with disabilities. To verify that a particular location is accessible, call: Calendar Clerk (415) 703-1203.

If specialized accommodations for the disabled are needed, e.g., sign language interpreters, those making the arrangements must call the Public Advisor at (415) 703-2074, TTY 1-866-836-7825 or (415) 703-5282 at least three working days in advance of the event.